

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 25-50 are pending. Independent Claims 25 and 40 find support *inter alia* in original Claims 1, 2 and 22. Claims 26 and 41 find support in the specification in the paragraph bridging pages 15 and 16. Claims 27-29 find support in original Claims 3, 4 and 6, respectively. Claims 30-33 find support in original Claims 7-10, respectively. Claims 34-35 and 42-43 find support in original Claims 14-21. Claim 36-39 finds support in original Claim 11-13. Independent Claim 44 and dependent Claims 45-50 find support in original Claims 1 and 14-19. Accordingly, the Applicants do not believe that any new matter has been added.

The Applicants thank Examiner Jagoe for the courteous and helpful interview conducted on June 19, 2003. It was suggested that claims directed to dental products that are applied or fitted within the mouth, such as those described on page 1 of the specification (tooth crown restoratives, dentures, etc., would likely be allowable. Moreover, the Examiner indicated that she might rejoin claims directed to the method of using such products, such as Claims 14-19, if they included all the limitations of an allowable product claim. Independent Claims 25 and 40 are directed to dental materials that are applied within, or applied to materials fitted within, the mouth. Independent Claim 44 is directed to a method of using the recited composition within the mouth or on dental materials fitted within the mouth. Accordingly, favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

REJECTION - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 4-6, 8-12 and 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hayakawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,165,256 A). This rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of these claims. It would not apply to the new claims which are directed to dental materials applied within, or applied to dental materials fitted within, the mouth. For instance, Claim 25 requires that the dental material be one that is applied within or fitted

within the mouth, such as crown tooth restoratives, dentures, etc. On the other hand, Hayakawa et al., is directed to equipment, such as dental mouth mirrors (col. 5, line 65) and converging lenses for dental treatment equipment (col. 6, lines 15-16). Such products would not be fitted within the mouth. Accordingly, the Applicants submit that this rejection would not apply to the new claims which are directed to a class of products that are applied within or fitted within the mouth. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that this rejection now be withdrawn.

REJECTION - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayakawa et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,165,256 A, in view of Remington's Pharmaceutical Science (1975). This rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of these claims. As discussed above, it would not apply to the new claims which are directed to dental materials applied within, or applied to dental materials fitted within, the mouth.

REJOINDER

New Claims 44-50 correspond to nonelected method Claims 14-19. As these claims include the compositional limitations and require the application of the composition within the mouth, or to a dental material fitted within the mouth, the Applicants respectfully request consideration of these claims along with Claims 25-43.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicants respectfully submit this application is now in condition for allowance. Early notification to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
NFO/TMC/cja


Norman F. Oblon
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 24,618

Thomas A. Cunningham
Registration No.: 45,394